DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 545 CS 011 147

AUTHOR Manzo, Anthony V.; And Others
TITLE Beyond the Lines: Forging an Educator's Blueprint for Education.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (41st, Palm Springs, CA, December 3-7, 1991). Best available copy.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS Communication Context; *Educational Issues

ABSTRACT

The imperative for educational reform is more pressing now than ever, but change is slow and unsure. This paper offers a series of 11 proposals designed to demonstrate that educators can more fully participate in the structuring and forming (more than "reforming") of education. In summary, the proposals, each of which is fully described in the paper, are as follows: (1) educators should begin to construct their own blueprint for education; (2) educational research should conclude, not simply with a recommendation for additional research, but with short essays that put the conclusions into context; (3) all agencies able to fund educational research should put aside 50% of funds to be used to reward and verify effective treatment-based research; (4) an Annotation Exchange system should be established; (5) Information Processing Tribunals should provide unbiased summaries of facts accompanied by authoritative opinions and analyses; (6) a system of communication among organizations should be established so that each knows what the others do; (7) creativity should be rewarded commercially; (8) the public school system should be revamped; (9) schools of education should once again operate laboratory schools where teachers can be trained as well as conceptually prepared; (10) schools of education should be restructured to reflect their special functions; and (11) the issue of racial inequity and the withholding of opportunity that discrimination has caused should be settled through direct compensation to the persons who have suffered the discrimination. Educators must be willing to accept responsibility for reforming education, and to create the time, place, and ethos to permit it. (Contains 24 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353545

Paper

41st Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference

Palm Springs, CA, December 3-7, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. V. Manzo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Beyond the Lines:

Forging an *Educators' Blueprint for Education*

Anthony V. Manzo, University of Missouri-Kansas City

in cooperation with: Sara Morgan, Park College

Vivian E. Ellis, University of Missouri-Kansas City

Educators have a way of keeping their noses to the grindstone, no matter how disconcerting the situation becomes. However, a nose to the grindstone can result in blurred vision and a pock-marked face. I mean to offer a case for lifting our heads, as a profession, and working more inventively though no less intensely.

Let's begin by asking the question that has become almost rhetorical. The question: Is the nation at risk because education is failing in its job? For many, the answer is so clear that they might begin, as did Edward Fiske in a recent article, by saying that "it is no secret that America's public schools are failing" (1991). However, there are others, such as Gerald Bracey who argue just as convincingly that allegations that the educational system has tumbled in recent decades constitutes a very "Big Lie" (1991).

I belong to a camp that holds that the educational system is successful, given its parameters, but that we can still further optimize our impact. I see us more as growing, evolving, and able -- normal regressions notwithstanding -- to meet the challenge of the next leg of the eternal footrace between chaos and order. Much that I will recommend ahead is born of this optimism and assertive posture. It is a posture that draws more than a little strength from the momentous changes in the formerly communist regions of the world. It is a posture, too, that says it is important to know that we are part of a larger

CS011147

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

evolutionary experiment, and that maintains a growing belief in the significance of enlightened experimentation. This realization alone is helping us to better monitor our actions and tolerate the experiments of others that we have tended to view in an adversarial way. There is a growing sense that everyone's experiment is our experiment. This perspective is permitting us to become better architects for an ecologically sound *blueprint for education*, that would flow from our collective commitments and calamities.

The Imperative.

The imperative for educational reform is more pressing than ever, but change is slow and unsure. In fact, it is even arguable whether children are failing, or whether other factors, such as our efforts to educate all children, and the overly focused efforts of nations such as Japan to maximize their limited resources in a largely homogeneous society, merely give the impression that our "averages" on standardized tests are mediocre, and our commitment to excellence weak. Nonetheless, these are the notions that most often are invoked to challenge educational reform.

I will not belittle them, nor any effort to improve this system of which we are a part, but it is a political agenda driving the questions, and therefore, it is the proposed answers, not the profound interest in educational process, and in career education, that, in our judgment, needs to be the "hard disk drive." The current buzzterm, for example, is "restructuring." This tends to mean de-centering, returning control of the school to the school -- its teachers, parents, and principals. In fact, restructuring most often means the creation of thousands of lesser boards and bureaucracies where there currently are already too many -- about 1500, if the number of school districts is taken as a guide.

Restructuring is not a bad thing. It may, in fact, be a necessary step, at some point, toward providing the kind and quality of education that America is currently desperate for. School districts seem to lose effectiveness as they grow larger, each improvement filtering through so many layers that by the time it reaches the classroom, teachers are hard-pressed to find its common sense, much less its interpretation into practice. Yet restructuring can mean anything. Schools undertake it, barely aware of what other schools are attempting or why. In Journal of Teacher Education, research editor Kenneth R. Howey opened an article about teacher education by saying that "A lack of *collective*, not individual, commitment to

3 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

program change severely constrains what might be in teacher preparation" (p. 3). I believe the same to be true of educational reform. We have not formed or exercised enough collective effort; thus, our individual efforts, which have been many and sincere, are too often ineffectual. Too often, they splinter and fragment our ranks. Too often, their major result is to radicalize a group that feels it must defend its territory, to polarize groups whose goals are identical but whose plans to achieve those goals are not.

We educators interpret schools to society and interpret society to schools. We need not speak in the same voice, but if we are ever to make a successful difference, we do need to work out the harmony. Logic tells us that one of the key elements in reaching such harmony is the need for some specific proposals, born in the crucible of educational operations, where the writing, research, teacher training, and classroom teaching take place, although not only there.

Now I shall advance such proposals -- proposals that require collective analysis, refinement, and finally effort to achieve. As with all proposals, they have the signature of the offerer. I think invention is the most important commodity that schools can trade in. Hence, these proposals tend to center on the importance of the creative process and inventive problem-solving. I am also a traditionalist in the sense that I see educators are guardians of the past, hence expect to see proposals that combine invention with convention. In every other respect, the reforms I propose are based on the concerns for the needs of all those who make education their life's work -- teachers, researchers, administrators -- educators of all sorts. These are the people who have often been too silent or too isolated or too objectively scientific to propose ways and means of teaching our children better, of helping our children become better learners. These people have , of course, studied and written, practiced and experimented. But too often their ideas, their innovations, the results of their studies and experiments and observations have been lost or disregarded, sometimes inaccessible to those who could benefit from them. We are, after all, in the information age, meaning that there is a ton of it produced each day, although, ironically, it seems to be imparting the impression that we cannot think or project or synthesize, since there is this underlying sense that we cannot keep up with it all.

Good ideas that do spring up are often buried under a mound of others that owe their place to the publicity they have garnered, to the hype they have generated. And, sometimes, good ideas are ignored

because no one can figure out who they belong to. Syntheses are hybrids, and hybrids can look like bastards when no one comes forth to claim them. Worse, they can become bastards when those endorsing them or criticizing them are driven by some warping personal agenda that does disservice to legitimate notions of what is "politically correct".

The first step toward reform, then, is to revamp the way we handle the information that we have so far accumulated and which continues to accrue at an astonishing rate. I view this step as one that will take us into what I call the "New Eclecticism," a tolerant paradigm for those uncomfortable with currently named choices, which often are conceived as critical over-reactions to prevailing traditions or conventions.

Let me briefly explain the paradigm of the New Eclecticism, its blood and sinews, bone and brain. Then I'll explain a few reform proposals that my own practice of this paradigm have led me to. I'll conclude by asking your reaction to these proposals on an attached survey form that you may reproduce an mail to us, if you so choose. In truth, we intended to survey conference participants, but not enough came to our session to justify a tabulation. Another humbling experience.

The New Eclecticism insists that along with doing more research on education -- on how children process language, decode words or manipulate numbers -- that we recognize our own capacities to think beyond data points, to learn from our varied experiences, to chart our own way. I suggest, in other words, that we periodically look up from our workbenches and create a place to record our best impressions for not merely how to reform education, but to originate and continually modify an organic blueprint for education.

Proposal 1

Hence, my first proposal is that we begin to write a continuing book, for which this paper might be recorded as Chapter I, and call it "An Educators' Blueprint for Education." We are, you know, much better qualified to do this than any blue ribbon commission of astronauts, ministers and businessmen that have ever been appointed. To achieve this, however, requires that we respect ourselves and our traditions. This means ceasing the current practice of, one way or another, suggesting that all who came and thought before us are dinosaurs, or that our "fresh" ideas will make them so.

The philosophical basis for the "New Eclecticism" should be one of inclusion, not of exclusion. We should stand on the shoulders -- not on the heads -- of those who have come before us, those who have researched and written, those who have observed and studied and experimented, in the broadest sense. It is far more useful -- functional, if you will -- to conduct our work in a cooperative and interactive manner than in the traditional adversarial one. In other words, why must we justify every research project with the words, "Yet, curiously, no one has ever investigated the significance of thus and so." Or, in less empirical circles, there is the implicit claim that whatever we espouse is nearly unprecedented! Yetta Goodman's (1989) article "Roots of the Whole-Language Movement," in a language arts journal, while welcomed frankly seemed quite late in its effort to tie this philosophy to some very familiar moorings in reading education and language arts.

Further, we must create an educational research system that is more heuristic. Our research system should, in fact, encourage dialogue rather than simultaneous monologue, should engage us all in an ongoing dialectic rather than dead-end exchanges of opposing views that never reach synthesis. Education is, after all, a discipline and a profession that is practiced, not merely discussed. Reaching consensus is vital to that practice, and despite some gallant attempts by some to do so (Alvermann & Swafford, 1989; Swafford & Alvermann, 1989; Blanchard, et. al., in press; Berliner, 1989; Duffy, 1982; Galluzzon & Pankratz, 1990; Kagan, 1990; Manzo, 1984; Shavelson, 1983), there still is no continuing effort or mechanism for establishing a shared knowledge base.

Scientific research provides data, minds construct meaning and interpretation. Think, for a moment, about how the the typical article in a research journal concludes. It provides careful details on research design, though few on the substantive matter of treatments. It then gives results, shares some guarded inferences, and cries out for additional research. Our typical research studies, in fact, generally mirror lower-order thinking skills: We observe and conclude, and the analysis we provide is usually narrow. Where is our synthesis? Why do we ignore application? Is there application for the knowledge we make?

You know there is. From our writings there often emerges the policy issues that drive careers and schools. In order to have those careers and school policies be more reasoned, however, our studies need to be written in language that is more understandable. If the power community is to understand what the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

research community knows, the research community has to use the language the power community knows. Our studies, then, should rely less on the short-hand vocabulary of educational jargon, and use instead a more public and accessible language.

Given that my first Proposal is that educators should begin to construct their own blueprint for education, I will go on to Proposal 2.

Proposal 2

To raise the literacy levels of our own research from that of writing and reading "the lines" and "between the lines," to projections "beyond the lines," our educational research should conclude not merely with a recommendation for additional research, but with short essays that put our conclusions into context. P. David Pearson referred to this as "essay scholarship" in accepting the Oscar Causey Research Award last year. However, I mean something a bit more pragmatic in this context. The essay should risk recommending ways that our discoveries can be used. Without context, studies are not studies but data points, social science factoids, if you will. Stating possible applications imparts a better sense of how findings relate and may relate to larger conceptual issues. Doing so also could lead to more ambitious and more useful research, for, from its start, the researcher would be searching for practical solutions as well as keener understanding of real problems: The best theories come from working solutions, as do the best theories spring from "gnarley" practical problems.

One of the great mis-impressions of the 20th century may be that science is a carpet woven with threads of sterile objectivity. Wayne Otto (1991) put it more honestly. Stories, he said. Research is stories with people and contexts. These are the most honest representations of all the facts.

My third proposal is highly related to the first two. It addresses the issue of whether professional education is a *craft* or a *technical* field.

Proposal 3

Oddly, one of the greatest inhibitions to higher-order thinking in educational research is the separation of research technicians from clinical specialists. I'm not talking here about the frequent call for better cooperation between Universities and public school teachers, but a more initializing step -- the

cooperation between professors with rich teaching backgrounds and those with stronger technical, design, and statistical orientations.

To provide incentives for such cooperation, patterns and procedures for funding research need to be restructured. My third proposal, then, is that all agencies able to fund educational research need to put aside approximately 50% of funds to be used to reward and verify effective treatment-based research, more so than to fund elegant proposals to conduct research. This immediately has the effect of putting more players on the field, and not merely those who can write "fundable" proposals. It is no secret that those with the heavy funding in any field have rarely been able to compete successfully with those who tinker in their garages and emerge with new flying machines. There are several formulas by which this can be done: I will describe one.

Completed research projects would be submitted to a reviewing board for evaluation. Finalists would be interviewed by the board, both so they could better evaluate findings and to learn from effective problem-solvers what factors and elements they drew from to reach their innovative questions and/or answers. The board's final selections would be turned back to the funding agency with recommendations as to which completed projects should be put out in contract form to be independently verified or replicated. When a study is first selected, the researchers would receive 40% of estimated costs. Once its findings are cross-verified, they would receive 100% of costs, for a total of 140%. They, in turn, would be expected to spend half of the second amount on new or continuing research, the remainder should be theirs to keep! The review boards also could recommend fresh ideas to the granting agency from "non-winners" that seem to deserve to be encouraged with smaller pilot-level grants for consultation with either technical or craft specialists.

There are benefits to this plan, additional to urging cooperation among craft-based and technically-competent researchers. The most substantive of these is that it would allow more research to be done that is divergent and inventive, and therefore not likely to be funded by review boards that tend to be convergent, and bound by classical research paradigms. After all, the most difficult studies to get funded, and in a way the most important to be done, are the ones that are submitted by persons who don't like to color between the lines. Under this plan, too, many more individuals and collaborating groups would

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

immerse themselves in "end around" problem-solving, rather than more "up the middle" approaches.

Proposal 4

The fourth reform I propose would add a new dimension to interactive reading and collaborative writing, while helping to provide an additional means to reach syntheses. It stems from the idea for an Annotation Exchange system which emerged as part of a series of potential innovations for libraries (Manzo, 1973, 1990; Manzo & Manzo, 1990). The system provides readers with a forum through which they can respond to what they have read. In an Annotation Exchange system, readers may write short, personal responses to what they have read, much like "letters to the editor." In these, they may elaborate, affirm, argue, compare, or bring new information and perspectives to what otherwise would be unalterable text. Most importantly, however, the system allows readers to respond to the comments other readers have made -- to read not only a primary text but the responses generated from other minds. My colleague, Ann Pace, reminds me that the Talmud, the Jewish book of protocols for living, is constructed in a similar style.

The value of such a system is that it extends conversation and can create the mother of all human progress, the highly regarded but infrequently found dialectical interaction. Synthesis requires such a process, but it is difficult to arrange colloquia with an optimal mix of professionals and informed laypersons.

A lowly form of this system does exist in current discourse. Many of our journals publish reactions to articles -- reactions in which invited experts respond to the content or the ideas or the methodology or the claims of an article in the same issue in which the article appears. But this invitation list is too short. Most readers are not invited to participate and are by that lack mere spectators. These spectators may of course crash the ideological party by hurling their reactions through the windows known as letters to the editor. But not enough windows exist, and by the time a letter appears in a subsequent journal the party's been over for some time.

An Annotation Exchange system overcomes some of these problems. Anyone who is interested in doing so has a forum in which to make his or her views known. The forum is immediate -- one can respond as one reads an article or within days or months. One can express changing opinions, express a change in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

perspective that has occurred as a result of considering the views of others whose annotations have been recorded. One needs a computer and access to the system -- no small dance card, but one that can be obtained by most who are interested in the whirl of our intellectual society.

Proposal 5

The fifth reform I propose also concerns the information we create and consume. We do, of course, create more than we can thoroughly consume. We do consume a good bit that does us no good, that cannot be digested -- some, in fact, that we cannot even name or identify. Most educational issues are more complex than the systems we have of analyzing the information relevant to their definition and solution. Education is not alone in this dilemma, of course. Knowledge industries accounted for more than 70% of the GNP. Even when raw information is available, consumers of educational research, like those of financial and demographic news, usually need some assistance in processing the information -- assistance best provided through the considered conclusions of authoritative, unbiased sources.

I further propose, then, what I call Information Processing Tribunals to meet the growing need of our field for this type of assistance (Manzo, 1982). These Tribunals (IPT's) would be based on the model provided by our judiciary system and designed to provide a forum for rational change. Without an appropriate place to express alternative views, reform tends to die or fall into the the hand of those with radical personal agendas. Such conditions lead to apathy, or, just as bad, to a counterpurge mentality. The result is that reform is grounded, opinions are confused, all views get muddled into inaction.

The judiciary system of the United States offers several useful models from which academics might evolve a forum from which to educate, arbitrate, and/or sanction change. Among the judicial functions which could be modified to meet varied demands and issues, for example, are "discovery" proceedings held to hear facts and clarify issues. We might also explore "equity" or "advocacy" proceedings as ways of hearing arguments on behalf of a position which some believe deserves more attention than it is receiving. We might even find uses for an "adversary" hearing -- a hearing in which a position might stand accused, and a case is made both for and against it.

Developing a complete analog of the legal system which suits the needs and character of our academic community might take some doing and some time in which to do it. Efforts to do so, however, seem

worthwhile, for the core of the judiciary system contains benefits which our current amorphous research and writing schemes do not provide. There is no place, for example, to bring new curriculum ideas. Such innovations cannot be promoted cell-by-cell in the schools or through our journals. Too much time elapses between writing and publication for our journals to promote or even announce innovative ideas; our journals have limited space and form requirement, and their circulation is limited both in numbers and in audience.

An Information Processing Tribunal could provide the last but not final word on the issues brought before it. Its implications would reach far. Written opinions, for example, begin to correct for a primary weakness in institutional and bureaucratic organizations -- their absence of memory and therefore of wisdom.

Even in the most enlightened bureau or decision-making body, records are kept only of decisions made and rules enacted. Few, if any, bureaus keep careful records of the reasons and conditions which led to their decisions. Thus, while the circumstances surrounding a decision or policy may change, the policy often remains the same. Its failure to respond to changing conditions creates massive disharmony between purpose and practice. Keeping records of such decisions as well as notations of the opinions and rationales for policy decisions might facilitate quicker and more effective response.

In short, an Information Processing Tribunal could assist educators at all levels by providing an unbiased summary of facts accompanied by authoritative -- though not authoritarian -- opinions and analyses of available information. Such a service would not only help educators stay better informed, but would help us build our collective efforts toward reform -- in part because we would have access to the same information and be participants in the same analyses.

To those who argue that the creation of a such a super-authority amounts to pouring all the power into one small tank, let me say that such super-authorities have already been created. They are our governors, our legislators, our testing authorities. The need for someone or something to guide decision-making is a felt need. The super-authorities created by that need are often individuals, agencies, or corporations who, facing little or no challenge, influence the field far out of proportion to the knowledge they hold. Thus, for example, the state of Arkansas has mandated that parents attend parent-teacher meetings. Educators

themselves must take authority of what they know -- not to exclude others, by any means, but to use their knowledge in clear and forceful ways to improve education at all levels.

I might add here that I believe that the sales of the findings of the tribunals could provide handsome incomes to the universities or organizations willing to try to provide them.

Proposal 6

Besides overhauling our system of research, reporting, and information pressing, the New Eclecticism also calls for revising the way our professional agencies, organizations and societies do business. How do we keep track of what we're doing? How do we discover and strengthen the links between organizations and interests? Typically, each organization will establish liaisons with a few other groups in order to establish areas of common interest. But no organization has enough liaisons with other groups to keep its members informed -- such a task is impossible to achieve. Thus, too often, educational groups, broad and narrow, from whole language enthusiasts to musicologist, from math teachers to those who advocate the teaching of values across the curriculum, some FIVE HUNDRED of these organizations are whirling in their own orbits, too many of them mistaking such trajectories for the entire universe. Such mistakes are dangerous; they are also unfair to the perspectives and contributions each organization offers.

Any educational force with great momentum inevitably becomes a target for a counterforce that assembles its power in much the same way that education has purged itself of behaviorism or behavioral psychology -- a benign point with too strong a voice in the person of B.F. Skinner. Sensing an extremist position, we turn away; too often, we deny a *kind* of strategy because we disagree with the *amount* of it that is useful. Behaviorism was never a panacea, but it also is not an idea that should be recklessly trashed -- as it has been in recent years. Frankly, I fear that the same fate will befall Whole-Language. There already are gatherings of fundamentalist Christians who are calling it "demonic" and a "dreaded form of humanism." There also are phonic enthusiasts and even eclectics who are saying, "enough is enough -- this is just old wine in new bottles." In fact, it is a worthy idea with a penchant for calling all others unworthy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My sixth proposal for educational reform, then, is that we organize this universe, that we develop a system of communication among organizations so that we are better able to know what the Other does, how it operates, what it sees and knows, the words it speaks in, and how what we see and know can help clarify the path of the Other. Doing so almost requires that each organization periodically try to reach a consensus -- to say periodically: Our organization can agree on this, we share these beliefs and practices, this is the current state of our knowledge. But on these other matters we have not yet made up our minds.

How can such a mega-organization operate? It can do so simply by holding periodic meetings to compare notes on relevant issues. Every three years, for example, a different group would be expected to host the tri-annual conference.

Such meetings could be funded through contributions from its member organizations as well as through grants. In return, the organization would serve its member organizations as a resource, providing an omnibus or anthology of information, making provisions for the sharing of better ideas, providing access to other groups and organizations whose purposes and interests the individual educator remains largely unaware of. Most importantly, it can provide places for invention, a way of discovering ideas and revising them.

Proposal 7

Suggesting such a foundation leads me naturally to the seventh reform -- one a little more abstract than the earlier ones, but one made easier merely by assertion. My seventh proposal for improvement of education concerns the creative process, a process too often disregarded when we observe our educational system and study its workings. In short, we need to express a higher regard for creativity. One way of doing so is by doing what we are now proposing -- trying to invent our own way. Another, which is the substance of the seventh proposal, is to discover commercial means of rewarding creativity. To this end, I propose that foundation be established: a not-for-profit institute charged with supporting research and ideas that assist effective teaching at all levels and provides financial incentives for such creative activity.

I myself choke a little at advocating outright commercialization of aspects of educational research and the systems and products such research engenders. But then I reminded myself that education is a business -- one which generates hundreds of millions of dollars each year to publishers, architects, engineers,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

consultants, maintenance and cafeteria services. However, little of this money is re-circulated back into its primary mission. The re-circulation of money within a system is the primary earmark of a solvent and thriving enterprise.

Thus, a reform proposal that the creative process become a marketed and rewarded part of education is not quite as radical as it first seems. Its primary benefit is that it would provide venture capital for our research efforts, and potentially attract investors from the private sector.

A foundation or institute that does what I propose would, of course, have to develop some clear and workable protocols, more so than rules, for conducting its business. Its purpose, I must stress again, must be to assist teachers at all levels and in all realms to teach and promote creative processes. Its products would include goods, but would stress services. Those goods and services would most likely emerge from among the ranks of educators -- teachers, administrators, researchers, parents, assistants -- whose creative ideas can then be developed and distributed through the knowledge that the business community possesses.

I envision such an institute as one which serves as a registry for better ideas, a patent office for ideas and systems as well as products; an invention based on an existing convention. These ideas may be based upon empiricism, upon experience, or upon intuitive knowledge. The institute would not only allow invention but encourage it by providing children and adults with a place and a chance to make their ideas known, to share ideas, to explore the possibilities they suggest. It would stimulate ideas that are systems-based -- ideas as small as a robust teaching procedure or as large as the one that currently allows me to drop a letter into a mailbox on Main Street and be fairly assured that, for 29 cents, it will be placed in the private receiving box of any individual in America whose address I write on the envelope. There are all kinds of analogs to the postal system, to bi-cameral government, and to the patent office--to name a few, that are waiting to be invented.

We tend to overlook the importance of such such systems to a society's progress because, once they are in place, they become a part of the society's autonomic nervous system, a part that keeps the body politic breathing, growing, and repairing, even when we are distracted or intentionally attending to other

things. Yet, the systems do sometimes need repair or innovation. Many of the systems of the educational body currently need such attention.

A Foundation for Better Ideas could encourage such attention and facilitate needed repairs or inventions. It could also serve as a spokesgroup for Congress in funding issues, could work with legislative groups to promote innovations, amenable protocols, and even product developments that current systems and practices cannot assimilate -- a form of systems enhancement, perhaps. The Foundation could facilitate our research mightily, especially those involving practical application or those seeking to forge links between disciplines or interests, for the institute would maintain records of the new ideas that have been put forth on various topics or within certain areas.

Inventors hold patents. Authors and lyricists receive royalties. Why should there be no reward for the educator who invents and creates, especially when his or her ideas may be transformed into capital venture by someone else?

The proposed institute for the registry of better ideas need not be limited to education. In this regard, education could lead the way. Basically, it would monitor and pay royalties to those whose ideas are registered and/or developed, thereby establishing ownership of ideas designed to improve societal systems such as education. Such a procedure would indeed by based upon competition, but also authentic collaboration, and would indeed create a competitive market if dollars are to be earned. Research, then, could earn money for its practitioners. The system, as hinted earlier, could also provide a means of obtaining research start-up funds -- a current difficulty. Over ninety percent of the proposals made to the Office of Education are not funded. What a waste of human energy and devastation to the spirit. If a potential for profit exists, of course, companies and venture capitalists would support the institute, as would profit attract great minds driven by enlightened self-interest. Such funding could be invested as part of the portfolio of a well-diversified company, with educators having established working protocols, including checks and balances, rules and guidelines, consequences and punishments, that would guide this interface. It is essentially this system that has created the current boon in innovative drugs and soaring values of drug companies -- a valuable symbiosis that is revolutionizing medicine and health care in ways unimaginable just a few years ago.

Proposal 8

The last three reforms I propose also have to do with creation and convention, but they focus on changes for our students and our society rather than for us as professional educators. The first of these is that we must revamp our public school system. We often hear cries for longer school days and more school days -- but such cries seem to accept that prolonged exposure to education results in education. It does, but in much the way that cookies add to weight gain without adding to nourishment. By improving the quality of time our students spend in school, we can improve their education. Making that improvement is no small or simple task; it requires several changes in both belief and practice. One of those changes, however, must be in the way we structure the school day. We can structure the day for active learning. We can recognize that every school day, every school year, serves both instructional and custodial functions. I propose, then, that we recognize those functions and fill them in the way their very nature demands.

I see three ways school time is allocated, though each of these tends to be done inefficiently and by the same person. Part of the time is allocated to instruction; part to practice; and part to the custodial functions of giving children a place to be during the day, of running the school, or interrupting and announcing and pulling out for special projects. Currently, almost every hour contains some instruction and some practice, and custodial time is spread throughout school hours. What better use of our resources and our students' growing abilities if we parcelled time more judiciously to function. The current impression that teachers and students can spend seven to eight hours a day in classwork is dysfunctional. Both teachers and students begin the day with the sense that they are entering a marathon, so neither wishes to sprint or strain. This condition countermands findings that say that engagement (Fisher et. al. 1978) and quick pacing results in better learning for all students at all levels (Brophy, 1979; Barr, 1973-74). By this plan, each student could spend part of the school day with a teacher whose specific and reduced role is to instruct. Another part of the day could be spent with a different teacher who specializes in practice -- a teacher, in other words, who is well-equipped to supervise small groups of students in active implementation of their lessons. The remainder of the school day could be supervised largely by "custodial" specialists who can help kids make the most of assemblies, clubs, extracurricular activities,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and housekeeping chores and announcements. This arrangement alone would reduce the school day for master teachers to a manageable 90-120 minutes of instruction per day, and give back to instruction the time lost in random interruptions in most schools today. Recently, a teacher in Ohio commented to us that she now gets about 20 minutes of instructional and practice time out of each hour her students spend in her classroom -- all the rest is siphoned off. Twenty interrupted minutes a day of English, of math, of biology. No wonder our students are not learning as well as they are capable.

Proposals 9 and 10 address Schools of Education, which also are in need of restructuring. Several features strike me as potentially important, I will mention only two here.

Proposal 9

First and foremost, Schools of Education must once again operate some form of laboratory school where teachers can be trained as well as conceptually prepared. Teaching involves mastery of certain *performance* skills as well as the vaunted *capacity to be reflective*, Medical Schools have teaching hospitals, Law Schools have moot courts, Dental Schools operate clinics. Yet, professional Schools of Education have only distant and often vague connections to children and schooling. In the absence of such, it should be no surprise that our credibility as craftspersons and as pundits is frequently called into question. The presence of real children, even the if they were the "elite" children of faculty, and they need not be, would help re-establish our capacity and focus on educational process. The problems that previously were associated with "lab schools," including financing, must be worked out. Trying to function without lab schools puts us in violation of one of the most basic principles of professional operation. We simply cannot persist in this educationally unsound way, and expect to graduate credible professionals

Proposal 10

In a related vein, Schools of Education need to be restructured and administratively formed to reflect our special functions. Arguably, we have five main areas of responsibility: teacher education; graduate degrees; research; self-service and management; and community service. Most schools have a division of teacher education. Most also now have an executive committee of the faculty to share management with the dean. A few have a dean or a coordinator of continuing education and community services -- although they

typically do not compete well for the information dollars in this service and information age. Few, however, have a dean of research and doctoral studies. Research, and most aspects of doctoral study, are largely phantom activities with no tangible presence and no concrete inducements other than to "publish or perish." Research skills need to be nurtured in an environment that is focused. Every School of Education ought to have a research agenda, and functions that parallel those of funded research centers. Ideally, these would be connected to undergraduate education in several meaningful ways, including the creation of pre-doctoral programs to orient budding scholars early on to the notion that experimentation and creative problem-solving are viable options in education. There are other career possibilities as well that tend to be given short shrift; consider these examples of viable work options for education majors: Community college teaching, departments of education, education in business and industry, private practice, testing services.

To begin to rectify our exclusively departmental orientation, I would have our other "functions" become a second organizational scheme. Faculty then would have at least two affiliations: one in a department and a second or third in one of these functions. Under this plan, the review and promotion process would not grind to a halt once one became a professor or reached tenure. Rather, faculty could be encouraged to add as many "badges" as they chose. Properly managed, this would have the effect of giving just due to differentiated staffing, while providing a tangible way of creating task forces, more so than deliberative committees, that would be clearly charged and held responsible for a variety of important functions that never get done as well as they should; e.g., faculty evaluation schemas; following-up graduates; articulating curriculum and research directions.

Lest I give the impression that I see all these functions as co-equal, permit me to add that I do not. For colleges, the role of effective teaching should remain the chief and most highly rewarded role. For universities, it should be research and writing, and teaching at the post-masters level. To have it be otherwise is to create self-serving bureaucracies that sabotage the stated mission of colleges and universities.

Proposal 11

Finally, the last reform I propose regards a change for our society. I am referring to the issue of racial inequity. This reform may not at first seem like a proposal appropriate for a paper on education, but there is no other place where it can be more properly discussed. More importantly, however, the issue of racial inequity is one that currently forms policy in many school districts in many ways.

At present, the judicial system is the CEO of many schools systems -- systems such as Norfolk, Virginia, and Kansas City, Missouri. The judicial system builds schools, designs programs, sets school policy, influences personnel hiring, defines standards and tests by which they will be measured, and even levies taxes to fund the remedies it orders form current residents, though not past offenders. The remedies it orders are supposed to be cures for the ill-effects of segregation caused by the ugly pathology of discrimination. The remedies it offers are supposed to promote greater possibilities of equality in education, housing, and employment. The remedies, well-intentioned as they may be, also are somewhat reckless social experiments often uninformed by reasoned empirical research, oblivious to rippling side effects that seem to be producing a substantial backlash, and, so far, achieving few of their intended goals.

It is also true that this system has substituted judicial power for legislative responsibility, threatening the balance of power, the foundation of constitutional law, and leaving many school systems and communities feeling powerless. Most importantly, the questions that they are attempting to redress were caused by individuals now dead, dying, or moved to the safety of the suburbs, while those most entitled to redress are dead, dying, or languishing without fair compensation. Hence, I propose a different remedy, a relatively simple one. It was encouraging to see a version of it in a Time magazine essay (Krauthammer, 1990) about a year ago. Importantly, the remedy I propose does not warp constitutional law, and it has not only a beginning and a middle, but, it has an end -- something that cannot yet even be contemplated under plans the courts continue to order. It also does not lay guilt at the fact of trip on all current Americans, nor leave those who have been hurt in a forever state of seeking demeaning "special consideration".

Simply, I propose that the issue of racial inequity and the withholding of opportunity that discrimination has caused be settled through direct compensation, usually in the form of cash payments, to

the persons who have suffered the discrimination. I can offer several formulas for the determination of such payments and options for litigants to choose from of different ages and with evidence of differing levels of disruption of their lives, but I shall skip these for the present to address the aspect that most people will find most offensive about such a proposal -- that of monetary compensation for pain endured.

Money is a most ingenious and common form of reparation for suffered wrongs. With money, those who have experienced educational, employment, and housing discrimination will have a means by which to remedy their own sufferings in their own chosen ways, by living where they choose, seeking the schools they choose, preparing for the jobs they choose, or establishing the businesses they choose. In short, the proposal I am making holds again to one of the standards that I referred to in the 'New Eclecticism': invention plus convention. That is, standing on the shoulders, not the heads, of those who have dealt with analogous problems before us.

In conclusion, I hope that the readers have found these proposals worthy, in the sense of plausible. Again, they are intended to demonstrate that as educators, we can more fully participate in the structuring and forming -- more so than reforming, education. However, we must be willing to accept responsibility for doing so, and to create the time, place, and ethos to permit it. There is an additional educational bonus for doing so: both children and society will be served better when we assume roles as models of enlightenment more so than mere cloistered advocates of it.

References

Alvermann, D. E., & Swafford, J. (1989). Do content area strategies have a research base? Journal of Reading, 32, 388-394.

Barr, R. C. (1973-74). Instructional pace differences and their effect in reading acquisition. Reading Research Quarterly, 9, 526-554.

Berliner, D. (1989, August). Expert knowledge in the pedagogical domain. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Blanchard, J. (1989). An exploratory inquiry: The milieu of research in secondary, content-area reading methodology textbooks. Teacher Education Quarterly, 16(1), 51-64.

Blanchard, J., Rottenberg, C., & Jones, J. (in press). Pedagogical knowledge and elementary reading methodology textbooks: In search of a shared paradigm. Reading Psychology.

Bracey, G. W. (1991, October). Why can't they be like we were? Phi Delta Kappan, 73(2), 104-117.

Brophy, J. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 733-750.

Duffy, G. (1982). Fighting off the alligators: What research in real classrooms has to say about reading instruction. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14(4), 357-373.

Fisher, C. W., Filby, N. W., Marliave, R. Cahen, L. S., Dishaw, M. M., Moore, J. E., & Berliner, D. C. (1978a). Teaching and learning in the elementary school: A summary of the beginning teacher evaluation study (BTES Rep. VII-1). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Fiske, E. B. (1991). Smart schools, smart kids: Why do some schools work? New York: Simon & Schuster.

Goodman, Y. (1989). Roots of the whole-language movement. Language Arts Journal, 90(2), 113-127.

Gulluzzon, G., & Pankratz, R. (1990). Five attributes of a teacher education program knowledge base. Journal of Teacher Education, 41(4), 7-14.

Howey, K. R. (1991). Reflections of the JTE research editor (1984-1989). Changes in teacher education: Needed leadership and new networks. Journal of Teacher Education, 41(1), 3-9.

Kagan, D. (1990). Ways of evaluating teacher cognition: Inferences concerning the goldilocks principle. Review of Educational Research, 60(3), 419-69.

Krauthammer, C. (1990, December). Reparations for black Americans. Time, pp. 18.

Manzo, A. V. (1973). Reading and English: A demonstration project. Journal of Reading, 16, 539-545.

Manzo, A. V. (1982). An information processing tribunal (IPT) for adjudicating complex issues in education. . . and public policy. In G. McNinch (Ed.), Reading in the disciplines. 2nd Yearbook of the American Reading Forum (pp. 40-42). Athens, GA: American Reading Forum.

Manzo, A. V. (1984). Toward a core curriculum for reading education. Reading Teacher Education. 24th Yearbook Forum of Reading (pp. 8-9). Fitchburg, MA: Fitchburg State College.

Manzo, A. V. (1990). ANX. A school-based and external system for promoting active reading and writing. Paper presented at World Congress on Reading, Stockholm, Sweden.

Manzo, A. V., & Manzo, U. (1990). Content area reading: A heuristic approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Otto, W., McMenemy, R. A., & Smith, R. J. (1973). Corrective and remedial teaching. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Shavelson, R. (1983). Review of teachers' pedagogical judgements, plans and decisions. Elementary School Journal, 83, 392-413.

Swafford, J., & Alvermann, D. E. (1989). Postsecondary research of content reading instruction. Journal of Reading, 33(3), 164-169.